



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,541	12/07/2000	Gregory Zoller	CSCO-68341	4178

7590 03/31/2004

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,541

Applicant(s)

ZOLLER ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 3/1/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 26-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 26-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to the amendment filed March 1, 2004.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 38 is objected to because of the following informalities: the "objection" in "objection request broker" of the claim should be "object". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 2-9, 28, 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the "central repository" is not defined and supported the claim language.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2-9, 28, 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because the "central repository" is indefinite. In the interest of compact prosecution, it is assumed that "central repository" is a database of information objects.

Art Unit: 2171

4. Claims 3 and 10 recites the limitation "said information", in step g) of claim 3 at the first line and in step e) of claim 10, is ambiguous. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 2-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 26-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoover et al. (U. S. patent no. 5,560,005) of record in view of Challenger et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,256,712) of record and further in view of Gasior et al. (U. S. patent no. 6,691,166).

Regarding claims 3 and 31, Hoover discloses a method of providing access to information comprising the steps of:

a) a central repository receiving a call from an application program, the call specifying a user identifier and a requested set of information of a plurality of sets of information (see Fig. 3, corresponding text, col.16, lines 54-58 and col. 28, line 60 to col. 29, line 4, Hoover). Hoover discloses in Fig.3 that the "Object 1" of the patient object in the patient database or repository receiving a call from application program to request a message or a set of information in physician object. The patient and physician who sending the request or receiving the response have to be identified or have to have an user identifier;

b) in response to the call, the central repository determining the location of the requested information corresponding to the user identifier (see Fig. 3, col. 24, lines 47-49 and col. 28, line 60 to col. 29, line 4, Hoover);

b1) determining a plurality of fields associated with the requested set of information (see col. 15, lines 4-15 and col. 24, lines 25-33, Hoover); and

b2) accessing a stored mapping of the fields to the databases (see col. 24, lines 9-33, Hoover);

c) using the user identifier, the central repository retrieving information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 24, line 60 to col. 25, line 8 and Fig. 1, Hoover). The information of the “client site 1” corresponds to the first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases;

d) using the user identifier, the central repository retrieving information corresponding to a second of the plurality of fields from a second of the plurality of databases (see col. 24, line 60 to col. 25, line 8 and Fig. 1, Hoover). The information of the “client site 2” corresponds to the first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases; and

e) the central repository providing the set of information to the application program, retrieved from the first and second databases without requiring storage on an intermediate database (see col. 11, lines 48-67, Hoover).

Hoover, however, does not explicitly disclose “storing in a cache the set of information”.

Challenger, on the other hand, discloses a method for maintaining and making consistent updates to caches including the step of storing information in cache (see Abstract and Summary of Challenger). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

Art Unit: 2171

system of Hoover to store the requested information in cache because it is for the security reason and system's efficiency.

Hoover and Challenger combination does not disclose the step of "moving a portion of said information from said first of said plurality of databases to said second of said plurality of databases, wherein said moving of information is performed transparently".

Gasior discloses a system and method for transferring partitioned data sets over multiple threads including the step of transferring the portion of data set or information from the first computer data storage to the second data storage in communication computer nodes (see summary of Gasior). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover and Challenger to move the portion of information from one database to another database because it is for the flexibility of data's usage. Please note that the call and request information from application program in step a) has nothing to do with or not aware of the movement of the portion of information in step g). Therefore, the moving of information is performed transparently to the application program.

Regarding claim 2, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses determining the entitlement status corresponding to the user identifier with respect to the set of information (see col. 16, lines 31-35, Hoover).

Regarding claims 4-5, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses the step of updating a first of the plurality of fields in the set of the information by writing information to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 27, line 62 to col. 28, line 10, Hoover).

Regarding claim 6, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses that the update is based upon monitoring activity of a user of the application program, the activity being related to the information (see col.3, lines 14-24, col. 39, lines 54-64 and col. 53, lines 23-37, Hoover).

Regarding claim 7, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses a first database with entitlement information thereon and a second database with user profile information thereon (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 31, Hoover).

Regarding claim 8, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses the steps of providing a parameter to the application program and the application program passing the parameter when requesting user profile data (see col. 29, lines 1-4 and lines 32-50 and col.54, lines 15-17, Hoover).

Regarding claims 10, 16 and 26, Hoover discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon program instructions for providing access to information stored on a plurality of databases:

- the program further operable to process requests from an application program, the requests identifying a first of the plurality of logical collections of the information and a first of a plurality of users (see col. 11, lines 48-67, hoover);

- the program further operable to retrieve the information corresponding to the at least the first of the plurality of fields, the information corresponding to the user identified by the request from the application program (see col. 12, lines 1-19 and Fig.2-3, Hoover).

Hoover, however, does not explicitly disclose the logical mapping and physical mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases. But, Hoover, discloses the mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases (see Abstract and col. 40, lines 24-56, Hoover). At machine level like the system of Hoover have to have physical address to locate a physical record (see col. 17, lines 4-14, Hoover), and the record have to have the identification (see col. 41, lines 10-19, Hoover) to specify the record that is logical mapping of the records.

Furthermore, Hoover does not disclose “ storing the set of information and removing the set of information ... if it has not been accessed for a pre-determined period of time”.

Challenger, on the other hand, discloses these limitations (see Abstract and Summary of Challenger). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover to remove the information from cache or delete stale information when the pre-determined time has been out because it is for the security reason and system’s efficiency.

Hoover and Challenger combination does not discloses the step of “moving a portion of said information from said first of said plurality of databases to said second of said plurality of databases, wherein said moving of information is performed transparently”.

Gasior discloses a system and method for transferring partitioned data sets over multiple threads including the step of transferring the portion of data set or information from the first computer data storage to the second data storage in communication computer nodes (see

Art Unit: 2171

summary of Gasior). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover and Challenger to move the portion of information from one database to another database because it is for the flexibility of data's usage. Please note that the call and request information from application program has nothing to do with or not aware of the movement of the portion of information. Therefore, the moving of information is performed transparently to the application program.

Regarding claim 11, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses the computer wherein the plurality of databases comprises a first database and a second database (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 44, Hoover).

Regarding claim 12, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses the computer wherein the first database comprises entitlement information (see col. 15, lines 32-62, Hoover).

Regarding claim 13, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses the second database comprises user profile information (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 31, Hoover).

Regarding claims 15 and 27, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses operable program to update the information for the first of the logical collections of the information by writing to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 27, line 62 to col. 28, line 10, Hoover).

Regarding claim 17, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses the information relates to a single user (see col. 12, lines 20-31, Hoover).

Regarding claim 18, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the information pertaining to a group of users (see col. 12, lines 33-52 and Fig. 1, Hoover).

Regarding claim 27, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses the updating of the information for the first of the logical collections of the information (see col. 15, lines 33-44, Hoover).

Regarding claims 28-29, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combinations further discloses that the application programs are compliant with different programming languages from one other (see col. 9, lines 48-65 and col. 11, lines 48-55, Hoover).

Regarding claim 30, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses the process requests originating from more than one programming language (see, Hoover).

Regarding claim 32, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combination further discloses the entitlement status corresponding to the user identifier with respect to the set of information (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 31, Hoover).

Regarding claim 33, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combinations further discloses the updating the plurality of fields in the set of information (see col. 15, lines 33-44, Hoover).

Regarding claims 34-35, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combinations further discloses the requesting the set of information comprises information relating to a single user and a group of users (see col. 9, lines 8-47, Hoover).

Regarding claims 36-37, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combinations further discloses the providing a parameter to the application program that is used to track active user records (see col. 28, line 30 to col.29, line 10, col.54, lines 15-17, Fig.11 and corresponding text, Hoover).

Regarding claim 38, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combinations further discloses the program uses a first application program interface that allows reading and updating records on the plurality of databases and a second application program interface that allows creation of records on the plurality of databases, wherein the first application program interface is usable via an objection request broker and the second application program interface is not available via the objection request broker (see Fig.2,6, 13 and corresponding text, Hoover).

Regarding claim 39, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combinations further discloses the central repository performing concurrency management of information stored on the plurality of databases (see col.24, lines 31-42, Challenger).

Regarding claim 40, Hoover/Challenger/Gasior combinations further discloses the central repository associating a version number with a user record; the central repository updating the version number if the user record is updated; the central repository providing the current version number of the user record to applications requesting the user record; and the central repository allowing a write involving the user record only if a version number of the user record that is provided by an application attempting the write matches the version number currently associated with the user record (see col. 16, lines 59-65, Fig.16 and corresponding text, Challenger).

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fink (US Patent no. 6,473,765) discloses a method and apparatus that provides a technique and tools to allow a combination of existing customer databases to be used by transforming a portion of the data in the existing data warehouses into a second data structure.

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2171

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai HT
Art Unit 2171
March 11, 2004



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER